

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
at CHATTANOOGA

REBECCA W. THURMAN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No: 1:12-cv-178
)	<i>Collier / Lee</i>
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (“Application”) [Doc. 2] filed by Rebecca W. Thurman. Ms. Thurman’s Complaint [Doc. 1] seeks review of the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying her disability benefits.

Because the Application did not contain sufficient information to allow the Court to determine Ms. Thurman’s indigence, the Court previously ordered Ms. Thurman to submit an explanation of her Application within 30 days of the Order [Doc. 3]. Although Ms. Thurman is represented by counsel, the time to supplement the Application has now passed and Ms. Thurman has not provided the requested information. As Ms. Thurman has not timely supplemented her Application with information sufficient for the Court to determine her indigence, I **RECOMMEND**

that Plaintiff's Application [Doc. 2] be **DENIED** and the case be **CLOSED**.¹

SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

s/ Susan K. Lee

SUSAN K. LEE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Any objections to this report and recommendation must be served and filed within fourteen (14) days after service of a copy of this recommended disposition on the objecting party. Such objections must conform to the requirements of Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Failure to file objections within the time specified waives the right to appeal the district court's order. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 n.7 (1985). The district court need not provide *de novo* review where objections to this report and recommendation are frivolous, conclusive and general. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986). Only specific objections are reserved for appellate review. *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).